

### *Paragraph 80*

Internet service is like a phone service. Its purpose is to bring me *whatever content I want*. Its purpose is to carry packets—nothing more, and nothing less.

The Internet is not a cable TV service, where I am buying only certain channels. Furthermore, I can never know in advance which Internet services I might want. **I very strongly object to allowing anyone to block content** (except by my specific request). I also strongly object to allowing anyone to offer only part of the Internet, because then the whole Internet will surely be the deluxe package. I currently enjoy excellent, moderately-priced service. Don't mess with it.

If someone proposed a rule that allowed AT&T to connect only to certain phones, we would certainly consider that a severe attack on freedom. **I have to regard Paragraph 80 as a similar attack on freedom.**

The so-called “free-market” approach is to simply require disclosure of blocking. This is a completely inadequate solution, because (1) I have few, and rather poor alternatives for service; and (2) “disclosure” often comes in a few poorly written words at the end of 100 pages of fine print.

### *Paragraph 82*

By “throttling” I assume you mean throttling some content and not others. The system works well now, and would prefer that the FCC not harm that system. I had a phone that ran on a dedicated line, but AT&T **chose** to offer phone service over the Internet (VOIP), and I **chose** to move my phone to the Internet. This also includes conference calls. I also **chose** to use the Internet for video calls. The system works well, without throttling other services. **Don't mess with the system.**